

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

April 26, 2000

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education met for the regular business meeting at the Tides Lodge in Irvington, Virginia with the following members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Senator J. Brandon Bell
Mrs. Jennifer C. Byler
Mr. Mark C. Christie

Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson
Mrs. Susan L. Genovese
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers
Senator John W. Russell

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Acting
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Senator Russell gave the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE BOARD

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 23 meeting. Copies of the minutes had been distributed previously to all members of the Board for review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Noble and carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Schroder moved *Item G, Second Review of Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* to become *Item D* on the agenda. Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Davidson and carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

The motion was made by Mrs. Rogers, seconded by Mrs. Genovese, and carried unanimously for approval of the following items on the consent agenda.

- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List

- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans
- Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List

The Department of Education's recommendation is that funds be released for two projects in the amount of \$6,360,203 and funding for five projects in the amount of \$28,411,000 be deferred and the projects placed on the First Priority Waiting List. These recommendations were accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Carroll County	Laurel Elementary	\$3,486,763.00
Carroll County	Gladesboro Elementary	2,873,440.00
	TOTAL	\$6,360,203.00

First Priority Waiting List

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Staunton City	Bessie Weller Elementary	\$5,000,000.00
Rockbridge County	Fairfield Elementary	3,300,000.00
Spotsylvania County	Elementary #16	7,500,000.00
Prince George County	Prince George High	5,111,000.00
Bedford County	Liberty High	7,500,000.00
	TOTAL	\$28,411,000.00

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans

The Department of Education's recommendation for approval of five new applications in the amount of \$28,411,000 subject to review and approval by the Office of the Attorney General pursuant to Section 22.1-156 of the *Code of Virginia*, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Staunton City	Bessie Weller Elementary	\$5,000,000.00
Rockbridge County	Fairfield Elementary	3,300,000.00
Spotsylvania County	Elementary #16	7,500,000.00
Prince George County	Prince George High	5,111,000.00
Bedford County	Liberty High	7,500,000.00
	TOTAL	\$28,411,000.00

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

The Department of Education's recommendation to approve the financial report on the status of the Literary Fund as of February 29, 2000 was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

RESOLUTIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

- Resolution of Recognition was presented to Gary Anderson, Chair, Read Aloud in Virginia (RAV).

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Second Review of Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia

Mr. Schroder and Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent for accountability at the Department of Education presented this item. Mr. Schroder stated that this document is a second draft from the original proposal, which will be adopted as a substitute proposal. The Board will review each page of the document, and all questions that Board members may have will be answered and then the Board will vote on amendments. Once this is done, Mr. Schroder will ask Board members for any other changes, comments, or observations on the entire document. The document will then be adopted to go out for public comment.

Following are motions made by Board members as they reviewed the document by sections:

8 VAC 20-131-10 Purpose

Mr. Christie made a motion to strike the original proposed language and leave it as is. Ms. Noble seconded the motion. Senator Russell asked who changed the language. Mr. Schroder stated that he was not sure *what a life that was informed and free* meant and he took liberty and crossed out the language and made corrections. Mr. Schroder asked for a vote by show of hands. The Board members were informed that a “no” vote would keep the new language and a “yes” vote would keep the old language. There were four “yes” votes, four “no” votes and one abstention. The motion did not carry.

8 VAC 20-131-20 Philosophy, Goals, and Objectives

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-30 Student Achievement Expectations

Page 6.B, 3rd line—Mrs. Byler made a motion to use *will* because *may* is misleading. After further discussion, the Board decided to leave the language as it is.

Mr. Christie made to motion to add *in English or Math* after the last sentence in Section B. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Davidson carried unanimously.

Mr. Christie made a motion to add the following sentence after Section B: *In grades K-8, in no case shall a student be required to attend summer school or weekend remediation classes due solely to failing an SOL test in science or history/social studies.* Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion. Mr. Schroder explained that a *yes* vote would add the language and a *no* vote would be against adding the language. The motion carried with a vote of 7 to 2.

8 VAC 20-131-40 Literacy Passport Tests

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-50 Requirements for Graduation

Mr. Christie made a motion to add the following amendment to the middle paragraph: *In no case shall additional diploma requirements not in effect as of June 30, 1997 be prescribed by a local school board without expressed approval of the Board.* The motion was seconded by Mrs. Davidson and the motion carried.

Page 10.A—Mr. Christie made a motion to move the phrase, *including at least two sequential electives as required by the Standards of Quality*, to follow the first sentence. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Page 16.a—Mrs. Byler made a motion to change the paragraph to read as follows: *If the student is disabled and eligible for special education, the selection of the basic diploma may be made by the student's IEP team and the student, where appropriate, after the student's 8th grade year and participation in the SOL testing program. Students who were exempt from the SOL tests by their IEP team prior to the 2000-01 school year may pursue this option provided they meet other eligibility requirements.* Senator Bell seconded the motion. After discussing using *disabled* vs. *has a disability*, the Board decided that using *has a disability* is more clarified. The motion was amended to use the language *has a disability* instead of *disabled*. The motion was seconded my Senator Bell and carried unanimously.

Page 15.C.1—Mr. Christie directed attention to the last line and made the suggestion to use *shall* instead of *may*. There were no objections from Board members.

Page 17.iv—Mr. Christie made a motion to replace the second sentence with the following language: *In addition, the students shall meet requirements for employability as adopted by the local school board and shall earn the units of credit prescribed in section 2 below.* Mrs. Byler seconded the motion. The motion was amended to read as

follows: *In addition, the students shall meet requirements for employability as adopted by the local school board and subject to review by the Board and shall earn the units of credit prescribed in Section 2 below.* The motion carried unanimously.

Page 18.3—This section was discussed for clarification.

Page 18, Footnote 4—Mr. Christie made a motion to change the language to the following: *Students pursuing this diploma shall complete a career/occupations program of the students' choosing that meets the requirements of Section 1 above.* The same change will be made in paragraph 3.

Page 19.D—was discussed for clarification.

Page 20—Senator Russell made a motion to require an “A” average instead of “B” average for a student to receive the Governor’s Seal. Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion.

Mr. Christie made a substitute motion to keep the Governor’s Seal as is, requiring a “B” average, and change the Board of Education Seal to an “A”, which is the Standard Diploma. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and the motion carried. Mrs. Davidson opposed the motion. Senator Russell did not vote.

Mrs. Genovese made an amended motion to include the IB program. There were no objections.

Page 22.4, 5th line—Mrs. Byler made a motion to use the word *discipline* instead of *area*. After further discussion the Board decided to strike the word *area of* on line five, add the word *and* on line six, and substitute the word *field* for *area* on line eight.

Pages 22-23.5—Substitute the word *field* for *area* on line seven and do the same for the first line on page 23.

8 VAC 20-131-60 Transfer of Credits

Page 27, 4th line—Mrs. Davidson pointed out that it should be *subsection F*. The Board agreed.

8 VAC 20-131-70 Program of Instruction and Learning Objectives

Page 32.B—Mr. Christie made a motion to strike the language about the child study committee, unless it is required by IDEA. The motion was seconded by Senator Bell and carried unanimously.

Page 32, last paragraph—There was a brief discussion on regulations for gifted/talented students for clarification.

8 VAC 20-131-80 Instructional Program in Elementary Schools

Page 33.A—Mr. Christie made a motion to add the following language after the last sentence: *Each elementary school shall provide to its students a daily recess period of an appropriate length during the regular school year.* Mrs. Byler seconded the motion.

Senator Russell said he does not think the Board should be ruling on recess and a number of other things included in the document. Senator Russell said the document is loaded with a number of things that are ‘subject to review’ by the Board. Senator Russell suggested abolishing all the local school boards to make it easier on the State Board because this is what it seems to him what this Board wants to do. Senator Russell said he would not vote on any more micro-managing parts that will be put in the document.

Senator Bell said he would not support the motion because this will not stop the local school boards from canceling recess.

Mr. Schroder explained that a “yes” vote would be to add the recess provision and a “no” vote will be to prevent the provision. With a show of hands the vote was 4 to 4. The motion failed.

Page 35.C, Line 3—Mrs. Byler suggested that the word *for* be substituted for the word *in*. There were objections from the other Board members.

8 VAC 20-131-100 Instructional Program in Secondary Schools

No comments

8 VAC 20-131-110 Standard and Verified Units of Credit

Page 38.A and B—This section was discussed for clarification regarding 140 clock hours of instruction.

Page 39.C—Mr. Christie made a motion to add the following language to replace the next to the last sentence: *through the end of the 2000-01 school year unless a waiver is granted by the Board under the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-325.C or 8 VAC 20-131-330 of these regulations.* The motion was seconded by Senator Russell and carried unanimously.

Page 38.B, last sentence—Mrs. Byler said that the SOL Advisory Accountability Committee is using the words *substitute assessments* instead of *alternative*. For the purpose of eliminating confusion between alternatives as described through Special Education, Mrs. Byler made a motion to use the word *substitute* instead of *alternative*. Mrs. Noble seconded the motion. After a brief discussion the Board decided to keep the same language because it deals with measures and not specifically tests. Mrs. Byler withdrew the motion.

Page 39—There was a brief discussion regarding dual enrollment classes, and specifically, if they will count for verified credit and if they meet the criteria listed for tests.

Mr. Christie asked where in the document does it state that the National Computer Technology test will count for students selecting verified units of credit. Mr. Finley said that this would be one of the alternate measures that the Board would approve, and it will come under the multiple criteria.

Page 12, Student Selected Test—Mr. Schroder indicated that this should have a footnote with the following language: *Computer Science and Technology may satisfy this requirement as well as any other additional courses approved by the Board.* The same language will be added as a footnote to Student Selected Test on Page 14.

The Board discussed inserting a statement in the SOA document explaining the procedures to earn a verified unit of credit. The Board agreed to insert a statement at the bottom of page 38.

8 VAC 20-131-120 Summer School

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-130 Elective Courses

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-140 College Preparation Programs and Opportunities for Postsecondary Credit

Page 41, 2nd Paragraph—Mrs. Byler noted that the first sentence should read as follows: *Beginning in the middle-school year, students shall be counseled on opportunities for beginning postsecondary education prior to high school graduation.*

8 VAC 20-131-150 Standard School Year and School Day

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-160 Additional Reading Instruction

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-170 Family Life Education

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-180 Off-Site Instruction

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-190 Library Media, Materials, and Equipment

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-200 Extracurricular and Other School Activities

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-210 Role of the Principal

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-220 Role of Professional Teaching Staff

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-230 Role of Support Staff

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-240 Administrative and Support Staff Required

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-260 School Facilities and Safety

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-270 School and Community Communications

Page 59.B, Last Sentence—Senator Russell made a motion to change the language to *may* instead of *shall*. Ms. Noble seconded the motion. Mr. Christie made a motion to pending question. Mr. Christie explained that if the Board votes the pending question it would cut off debate in order to vote on the substitute motion. If the Board members want to debate some more, they should vote against his motion. Mr. Schroder requested a show of hands for the pending question motion. The motion carried. By a show of hands, Senator Russell's motion to change *shall* to *may* was defeated by a vote of 7 to 2.

Page 59.1—Mr. Christie made a motion to include assessments for a basic diploma. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried with a vote of 6 to 3.

Page 59.2—Mr. Christie noted that the word *percentage* should be used instead of *percent*.

Dr. DeMary assured Mrs. Byler that the word *substitute* was used anywhere that referenced assessments vs. methods or programs. Dr. DeMary said the staff also ran a computer spellchecker on *alternative* to see whether it was a measure or a program vs. an assessment.

Page 60.7—Mr. Christie asked if the language used for fighting reflected the language previously worked out with staff and the Attorney General's office. Mr. Finley said the language for fighting used in the SOA document is the same language used in the document related to the crime and violence report that schools file each year.

Page 63—The language should read as follows: *No later than the end of the first semester of each school year, the local superintendent shall certify to the Department compliance with this section.*

8 VAC 20-131-280 Expectations for School Accountability

Page 64.B.2—Mr. Christie made a motion to insert *junior high or before middle schools*. Mrs. Byler seconded the motion. After a brief discussion, Mr. Christie withdrew his motion.

Page 66.e—The language should be as follows: *the number of students who initially fail and subsequently pass SOL tests in English (Reading, Literature, and Research) and/or mathematics during any scheduled administration by the next school year.* There were no objections.

8 VAC 20-131-290 Procedures for Certifying Accreditation Eligibility

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-300 Application of the Standards

Page 74.A.1.a—Senator Russell made a motion to retain the language *fully accredited with honors* and *fully accredited with high honors*. Mrs. Byler seconded the motion. Mr. Schroder explained that a “yes” vote will reinstate *fully accredited with honors* and *fully accredited with high honors*, and a “no” vote will keep the current proposal, which is to eliminate *fully accredited with honors* and *fully accredited with high honors*. The motion was defeated.

Senator Bell said he still has the same concerns with this section of the SOA document as he expressed at the October Board of Education meeting. He thinks the labeling of schools as being fully accredited, accredited with warning, or conditionally accredited, will confuse the public, and the public will not understand what these labels mean.

Page 76.C.1—Ms. Noble made a motion to not go to 80% in 3rd grade but go to 75% in 3rd grade English and 75% in 5th grade English. Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion.

Senator Bell made a substitute motion for the average pass rate in grades 3 and 5 English shall be 70%. Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion. By a show of hands the vote was 8 “no” votes and 1 “yes” vote. The motion was defeated.

By a show of hands the motion for the average pass rate in grades 3 and 5 English shall be 75% and the combining of Grades 3 and 5 English and Math scores passed with 8 “yes” votes and 1 “no” vote.

Page 78.2, 4th line—Mrs. Davidson made a motion to add the following: *as defined in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-320 of these regulations*. There were no objections.

Page 80.a & b—Mr. Christie made a motion to use the word *by* instead of *in*.

Page 80.a—Mrs. Davidson noted that 80% needs to be changed to 75%.

Page 80.c—Mrs. Davidson said she found this section to be confusing.

Page 82.7—Mrs. Davidson asked if the language on combining scores would go on this page or somewhere else. Mr. Finley will insert language on combining scores where appropriate. Mrs. Davidson also noted that *for a period* should be stricken from the last sentence. There were no objections.

Page 86.9—The Board changed the language to *December 1*.

8 VAC 20-131-310 Improvement Planning for Schools that are Accredited with Warning

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-125 Recognition and Rewards for School Accountability Performance

Page 93.C—Senator Bell asked if the areas that school divisions receive waivers are above requirements for applying to become a charter school. Mr. Schroder said the main difference would be the academic clock-hour timeframe. Senator Bell requested the staff to produce a list of waivers allowed for charter schools.

8 VAC 20-131-330 Waivers

No comments

8 VAC 20-131-335 Special Provisions

No comments

8 VAC 20-131-340 Effective Dates

No comments

Appendix I

Mr. Schroder said these are the Board's original proposals and the concepts of benchmarks are not yet in the SOA. Mr. Schroder said the Board can decide not to have any benchmarks or make alterations and adjustments in the original proposal.

Mrs. Genovese asked if, instead of having Grade 3, Grade 5, middle, and high school, it would make more sense to have Grade 3, Grade 5, Grade 8, and Grades 9-12?

Mr. Finley said the reason the middle school was done this way is because some schools are giving the 8th grade Social Studies test in the 7th grade. There are also students in the middle school taking high school courses for credit, and all of these are combined into one score in each academic area. For example: the 8th grade math and Algebra I were combined with any other math in the middle school into one math passing rate. The same thing is done in the high school.

Mrs. Davidson made a motion for the math benchmarks to be the same as currently listed under Grade 5, which is 50%, 55%, 65%, and 70%. Mrs. Noble seconded the motion.

Mr. Christie made a substitute motion to propose 55%, 59%, 64%, and 70% for Grade 5 Math benchmarks. Mrs. Byler seconded the motion. By a show of hands the substitute motion passed.

Mr. Schroder read the following language for the review process: *A local school board is authorized to award a student a verified unit in a course where such students' performance is inconsistent with other recognized indicators of academic achievement. A local school board's decision in such matters shall be solely based on criteria and guidelines established by the Board. The Board may revoke a local school board's authority under this provision for cause as determined by the Board.* The Board adopted the language with no objections.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion for grades 3 and 5 math benchmarks to be 55%, 60%, 65%, and 70%, which brings them in line with middle and high school math benchmarks. Mr. Christie seconded the motion. By a show of hands the motion carried.

Page 38.B—Mr. Schroder read two paragraphs. The first paragraph is an alteration of the paragraph on page 38, Section B. The second paragraph is legislation passed for the gifted and accelerated students.

Paragraph 1: *A verified unit of credit for graduation shall be based on a minimum of 140 clock hours of instruction, successful completion of the requirements of the course and the achievement by the student of passing scores on the end-of-course SOL test for that course or alternative measures as described below.*

Paragraph 2: *Upon the recommendation of the division superintendent in demonstration of the mastery of the course content and objectives, qualified students may receive a standard unit of credit and be permitted to sit for the relevant SOL tests to earn a verified credit without having to meet the 140 clock hour requirement.*

A motion was made to adopt the language and make conforming adjustments to the document. Mr. Christie seconded the motion. By a show of hands the motion carried.

Page 12—A footnote will be added to *Student Selected Test* with the following language: *A student may utilize alternative measures for earning verified credit in computer science, technology, or other areas prescribed by the Board in 8 VAC 20-131-10.B.*

Page 14—The same language would be used as footnote 5 for the advanced diploma: *A student may utilize alternative measures for earning verified credits in computer science, technology, or other areas prescribed by the Board in 8 VAC 20-131-10.B.*

Senator Russell made a motion to adopt the language. Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion. By a show of hands the motion carried.

Mrs. Davidson made a motion that schools teaching Algebra 1 in the 8th grade be allowed to average those scores in with their school, show these results on the Report Card, and allow the feeder high school to average the scores in with their pass rate for Algebra 1. Senator Bell seconded the motion. Senator Bell requested clarification on how the math scores at the high school level are pulled together for accreditation in math. After a lengthy discussion, Mrs. Davidson withdrew the motion and suggested that the Board wait until after public comment period.

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to adopt the *Proposed Revisions Regulating Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* in principal, subject to the revised draft being handed to the Board on Thursday and changes, if necessary, will be discussed on Friday. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. Noble made a motion that the Board of Education go into executive session under *Virginia Code* '2.1.344.A1 to discuss licensure matters related to specific teachers and administrators. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously. The Board went into executive session at 6:13 p.m.

Ms. Noble made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Ms. Noble made a motion that the Board certify by roll call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the executive session to which this certification motion applies, and (2) only such public business matters were identified in the motion convening the executive session were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

Board Roll Call:

Mr. Schroder - yes
Mrs. Rogers - yes
Mrs. Genovese - yes
Ms. Noble - yes
Senator Bell - yes
Senator Russell - yes
Mr. Christie - yes
Mrs. Davidson - yes

Mrs. Byler was not available to vote.

Ms. Noble made the following motion: That the Board of Education take the following actions relative to licensure cases:

- Case #1 The Board of Education voted to approve the issuance of a Virginia teaching license upon the individual's completion of a provisional license. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.
- Case #2 The Board of Education voted to continue the individual's teaching license. The motion was seconded by Senator Russell and carried unanimously.
- Case #3 The Board of Education voted to issue a special education conditional license. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Davidson and carried unanimously.

First Review of Teacher Survey Items

Ms. Noble, chair of the committee, presented this item. The committee recommended items to be included on a Teacher Survey component of the School Profile. The School Profile would be included on the annual School Report Card to provide patrons with a context for interpreting a school's accreditation rating and student performance on the Standards of Learning Assessments.

The proposed survey items were reviewed by the committee, critiqued by VCU's Survey Research Center, and field-tested with a small group of teachers. The recommended items reflect the feedback from the committee and field-test as well as the

expert advice from the Survey Research Center staff. The document is attached. (Attachment A).

Ms. Noble made a motion to waive first review and approve the survey items for inclusion in the on-line survey for 2000, recognizing that after the first year's experience, the survey items could be modified based on comments from the field. The motion was seconded by Mr. Christie and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Request for Approval of an Experimental or Innovative Program Involving Opening Prior to Labor Day

Mr. Schroder abstained from this issue because his law firm has provided legal counsel to the Virginia Hospitality and Travel Association. Mr. Christie abstained for similar reasons. Ms. Noble presided on this issue.

Mr. Finley presented a request from Martinsville City Public Schools to operate one of its elementary schools on a year-round schedule, which involves opening prior to Labor Day. Mrs. Davidson made a motion to waive first review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to approve the innovative program and Pre-Labor Day opening waiver for Martinsville. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Report on the Budget Actions of the 2000 General Assembly

This report will be presented at the May meeting of the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following person spoke during public comment:

Cata

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

There was no discussion of current issues.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting of the Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education was adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

April 27, 2000

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education reconvened the business session at the Tides Lodge in Irvington Virginia on Thursday, April 27, 2000 with the following members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Senator J. Brandon Bell
Mrs. Jennifer C. Byler
Mr. Mark C. Christie

Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson
Mrs. Susan L. Genovese
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers
Senator John W. Russell

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Acting
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

ACTION ITEM

Second Review of Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia

Following are motions made by Board members as they reviewed the document by sections.

8 VAC 20-131-10 Purpose

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-20 Philosophy, Goals, and Objectives

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-30 Student Achievement Expectations

Page 6.B, New Language—Add a *comma* after *previously passed*.

8 VAC 20-131-40 Literacy Passport Test

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-50 Requirements for Graduation

Page 10—Mr. Christie made a motion to withdraw the following language he had previously made a motion on to add: *In no case shall additional diploma requirements not in effect as of June 30, 1997 be prescribed by a local school board without expressed approval of the Board.* There was no objection.

Page 16C.1, 2nd line—Mrs. Byler made a motion to change the language *unlikely to meet the requirements* to who *have demonstrated an inability to meet requirements.* The motion failed for lack of a second.

Page 22.4, 1st line—Mrs. Byler made a motion to remove the words *of Excellence.* The motion was seconded. The motion carried.

8 VAC 20-131-60 Transfer of Credits

Page 30.H, 6th line—Mrs. Byler made a motion to add the word *additional.* The motion carried.

8 VAC 20-131-70 Program of Instruction and Learning Objectives

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-80 Instructional Program in Elementary Schools

Page 33.A—Mrs. Davidson said she would like to change her vote on the issue of recess for elementary schools. Mrs. Davidson made a motion to add the following as the last sentence: *In addition, each school shall provide instruction in art, music, and physical education and health and should provide students with a daily recess period during the regular school year as determined appropriate by the school.* The motion was seconded.

Senator Russell offered an amendment to the motion to add: *And one hour for lunch period.* The motion failed for lack of a second. Mrs. Byler asked if there was another place to put this statement instead of in the SOA. After a brief discussion, the Board decided to leave the statement in 8 VAC 20-131-80.

The motion carried with one abstention.

Later in the meeting, Mrs. Davidson asked that the wording be clarified as follows: the wording *recess period* should be changed to read *recess.* Mrs. Davidson stated that she was concerned that the word *period* would cause confusion. There was no objection.

8 VAC 20-131-90 Instructional Program in Middle Schools

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-100 Instructional Program in Secondary Schools

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-110 Standard and Verified Units of Credit

Page 38.A, 6th line—Mr. Christie made a motion to restore the original language as follows: *in a non-core academic course*, and on Page 40.C, 2nd line—to insert *core academic* between *per* and *course*. The motion carried.

Page 40.C, last sentence—Mrs. Byler made a motion to add: *If the school does not comply following the end of the 2000-01 school year, the Board may take appropriate action which may include, but not be limited to, adjustment or loss of school's accreditation*. The motion carried.

8 VAC 20-131-120 Summer School

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-130 Elective Courses

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-140

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-150 Standard School Year and School Day

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-170 Family Life Education

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-180 Off-Site Instruction

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-190 Library Media, Materials and Equipment

No comments

8 VAC 20-131-200 Extracurricular and Other School Activities

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-210 Role of the Principal

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-220 Role of Professional Teaching Staff

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-230 Role of Support Staff

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-240 Administrative and Support Staff Required

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-260 School Facilities and Safety

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-270 School and Community Communications

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-280 Expectations for School Accountability

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-290 Procedures for Certifying Accreditation

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-300 Application of the Standards

Page 79.4.a, 1st line—Mr. Christie directed attention to a typo. It should be *2000-03*. Mr. Christie also suggested that the word *the* should be added in the last line.

Page 81.b—Mr. Christie directed attention to a typo—to delete the word *that* in the bracketed language.

8 VAC 20-131-310 Improvement Planning for Schools that are Accredited with Warning

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-320 School Improvement Levels

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-330 Waivers

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-335 Special Provisions

No comments.

8 VAC 20-131-340 Effective Dates

No comments.

Appendix I

No comments.

Vote to Adopt the Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Establishing Standards of Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to adopt the proposed revisions of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* and authorize the staff of the Department of Education to move forward with scheduling an additional public comment period to receive comment prior to the final adoption of the revisions to the standards. The motion was seconded.

Senator Russell stated that there are a number of things in the proposed revisions of the Standards of Accreditation document that he does not approve of, and he will not support the document. He said the new draft was being used as a personal revenge. "It's not your document, it's the state's document," he said.

By a show of hands the motion carried with seven "yes" votes, one "no" vote and one abstention.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Schroder adjourned the business meeting of the Virginia Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education at 5:00 p.m. Mr. Schroder announced that the Board would reconvene into its Planning Session at 9:00 a.m. the following morning.

President

Secretary of the Board

**BOARD OF EDUCATION
PLANNING SESSION ON THE TEACHING PROFESSION
APRIL 27-28, 2000
IRVINGTON, VIRGINIA**

Summary of Discussion: Thursday, April 27, 2000

Opening Comments:

The president, Kirk T. Schroder, called the planning session to order at 9:00 a.m. All members of the Board of Education and the Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, were present. Also joining the board was Mrs. Phyllis Palmiero, the newly appointed director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Mr. Schroder also welcomed the consultants that will be making presentations to the Board throughout the day.

Mr. Schroder opened the session by welcoming all persons in attendance. He explained that the purpose of the Planning Session is to accomplish the following:

- focus the discussion on a topic of great importance to the work of the board for the coming year;
- give the board an opportunity to address the issue in detail; and
- develop an action plan for the coming year in order to address the issues and concerns raised at the Planning Session.

Mr. Schroder further explained that last year's Planning Session focused on the topic of accountability and how it is implemented in other states. It was a useful planning session, and the board learned a great deal of practical and helpful information, especially in light of the board's program of accountability moving forward.

This year, the Board of Education turned its focus to the teaching profession. Mr. Schroder emphasized that within the context of accountability and student achievement, *accountability* is not the goal; rather, it is the *means* to help us reach the goal. Our goal is to help children receive a quality education, and having a highly qualified and competent teaching force is absolutely critical to that end.

Mr. Schroder stated that the board will focus on the teaching profession and on developing a realistic plan of action to help teachers in Virginia as we go through our reform program.

Several distinguished professionals from North Carolina and Connecticut, who served as consultants, joined the board at this Planning Session. The consultants were invited to share their advice and experiences in developing and implementing programs to improve teacher retention, training, and professional development in this time of educational reform across the country.

The format for the program of the Planning Session consisted of the invited consultants making presentations on the programs in their respective states, followed by open, roundtable discussions and questions among the board members and the consultants.

Presentation by Dr. Charles Coble:

Mr. Schroder introduced Dr. Charles R. Coble, Vice President of School-University Programs at the North Carolina University in Chapel Hill. He is the former dean of the School of Education at East Carolina University and has an extensive list of publications, honors, and other professional activities to his credit. In addition to his current duties, he serves as the liaison for the 15 state universities that have teacher- training programs. During the past three years, Dr. Coble has been involved in developing and implementing an extensive network of university-public school partnerships, which include long internships and extensive collaboration with local public schools throughout the state of North Carolina. The various components of the partnership programs and participants are brought together through the Center for School Leadership Development, which Dr. Coble directs. Mr. Schroder welcomed Dr. Coble and thanked him for taking the time from his busy schedule to meet with the board at the Planning Session.

Dr. Coble thanked the members of the board for their service to the commonwealth. He noted that the task of the board is a difficult one and requires a great measure of commitment and dedication.

Dr. Coble began his presentation by describing the overall governance structure of the North Carolina university system. North Carolina's university system falls under one, umbrella governing board. Dr. Coble added that North Carolina's past several governors have been very supportive of public education and of education in general. This was critical in order to build momentum for the changes that have been implemented during the past few years. Also critical was that North Carolina's university system has had strong leaders during the past several years. This juxtaposition of strong leadership for education has resulted in about \$14 million each year in recurring education funding for professional development programs for teachers and school administrators. A number of programs are run by the state university's School Leadership Development Center. Some examples of these programs include:

- The Principals' Executive Program: An on-going program of professional development that all principals in the state go through at certain points in their careers.
- North Carolina Teacher Academy: Formed a few years ago; every year, 4,000 teachers go through this week-long, paid summer institute for professional development programs.
- North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching: An excellent program; 3,000 teachers each year go for residential, fully paid, intensive weeklong programs.

- Principals Fellows Program: provides \$20,000 per year as stipends for a two-year period for selected teachers to move from the classroom to the principalship. The best and the brightest are selected for this program.
- The Math/Science Education Network: This program puts about 6,000 teachers each year through a professional development program in math and science. This program provides young college students with adult mentors who assist them with their college work. The program is focused on minority students and is credited with encouraging a large number of minority students to become math and science teachers.

Dr. Coble said that the impetus for many of the current programs came a few years ago when the deans of the various colleges of education within the state university system formed a council to discuss issues and problems and to brainstorm solutions to mutual problems. The council drew up what it considered to be a realistic, workable plan to address the many concerns about improving the teaching profession. The council took this plan to the North Carolina legislature and made this promise: If the legislature provided the needed funding, the deans would reform teacher training. The council also gave the legislature a projected budget, or funding request.

Dr. Coble explained that, in short, what they proposed was this: longer, earlier, better supervised clinical field experiences for prospective teachers in their teacher education programs, so that when they graduate, they are well versed in the running of a school. Dr. Coble pointed out that some prospective teachers do not realize that almost one-third of the staff are not teachers in the classroom; rather, these are the support personnel such as nurses, social workers, special education resource persons, guidance counselors, occupational counselors. Prospective teachers need to learn how to work as a member of a larger team, the members of which are focused on helping the individual child. This requires training in that regard. What the clinical field experience attempts to do is assist the new teacher deal with the stresses and strains of the first year of teaching.

Schools lose a large number of teachers after the first year if the new and beginning teacher is unprepared for the unique and unexpected stresses of the job of a new teacher.

The deans also proposed a mentorship program (mentors would receive a stipends from the state) that would assist the teachers through the first three years of their teaching duties.

As a part of the work the deans did to develop their reform proposals for the legislature, they gathered an extensive amount of information on the teacher education. The deans undergirded their budget requests with data gathered on many aspects of the program: data on student academic progress, institutional spending for teacher education programs, per pupil costs for teacher education majors vis-à-vis other majors (e.g., medicine, nursing, pharmacy). Dr. Coble reported that gathering such extensive data requires a commitment from all parties. The data not only helped the deans formulate their proposals for teacher education reform, the data also revealed several facts that clearly ran counter to popular perceptions about the students entering the field of teaching and about teacher education in general. In this sense, the data were invaluable to the

ability of the deans to make persuasive and compelling arguments as they met with the legislators and subsequently took their points to the people of North Carolina.

One of the first questions the deans wanted to answer was: What is the operating fund for teacher education programs in North Carolina? The data included only the operating costs (excluded grants, salaries, or any other special funding). Institutions reported, and the deans verified the figures. These data were reported to the legislature. The 15 teacher education programs in the North Carolina produce 84 percent of the teachers hired annually in North Carolina. This amounts to more than 5,000 teachers each year. The data showed a total operating budget of \$2.5 million dollars. The deans then gathered the same data on other programs in the state: nursing, pharmacy, and medicine. When presented with figures showing how little funding is put into the preparation of teachers, Dr. Coble described the legislature as “totally embarrassed.” The data showed that approximately \$125 per year went into the operating budget to prepare a teacher; whereas, more than \$3,000 per year went into preparing a doctor and more than \$1,500 per year to produce a nurse. The data were revealing and persuasive.

Dr. Coble explained that, historically, the teacher preparation programs within colleges and universities have produced a well-documented phenomenon known as the “cash cow.” This has been the case since the end of World War II. The effect of this phenomenon is that the money paid in tuition by students in the teacher preparation program is used to support the other programs and majors within the college. In fact, Dr. Coble pointed out, the backbone of the development of many of the colleges and universities in this country was built on the dollars generated by the teacher preparation programs. The money did not flow back to the teacher preparation program; rather it was used for the university as a whole. In showing the “cash cow” phenomenon, the North Carolina deans were able to convince the legislature to provide an additional \$2.5 million to support teacher preparation programs. This amount was double what had been appropriated in the past for these programs.

Concurrent with the efforts of the deans and as a part of the broader efforts to improve education in North Carolina, the legislature adopted the North Carolina Excellent Schools Act. The package also included the following provisions:

- The commitment to bring the salaries of North Carolina public school teachers up from 48th in the nation to at least the national average by 2001.
- Funding to provide a \$1,000 per year stipend for mentor teachers.
- Funding for a 12 percent permanent salary increase for teacher who achieve National Board Certification (North Carolina now has 1,500 nationally certified teachers).
- Funding for a 10 percent salary incentive for teachers who complete/possess a master’s degree. Prior to this, North Carolina had one of the lowest rates in the nation of teachers who have master’s degree because teachers had little, if any, salary incentive to complete the advanced degree. As a part of this initiative, North Carolina colleges have totally revamped the master’s programs throughout the state. All

masters' degree programs in North Carolina are now focused around the National Board criteria for professional development.

As a part of the North Carolina Excellent Schools Act, the legislature wanted an accountability system that would show how the colleges and universities were performing in preparing teachers. As a result of this, the North Carolina's teacher preparation programs have now produced its first Institution of Higher Education Performance Card. Also, Dr. Coble pointed out that Title II of the Higher Education Act (federal program) would result in a national report card. The most recent guidelines for the Title II reporting have just been released, and all institutions of higher education that receive federal funds will soon be required to file the required data reports. In fact, Dr. Coble explained, the Title II reporting requirements are quite similar to the data gathered already by North Carolina. As soon as the national Title II requirements are in effect, all states will have to produce a report similar to North Carolina's. Later in the meeting, Dr. Coble noted that NCATE is moving to a similar performance-based system in its accreditation process.

Dr. Coble distributed a copy of the most current Institution of Higher Education Performance Card and briefly reviewed it with the board. He described the following points related to the performance report:

- ***Description of the Programs:*** *The report begins with documentation on where the teacher preparation programs are in North Carolina. The data are broken out by major, student numbers, majors. In total, 47 institutions in North Carolina have a teacher preparation program of some description. Of these, the fifteen state-supported institutions produce 84 percent of the teacher graduates. In North Carolina, all state-supported institutions that have teacher preparation programs are required to have NCATE accreditation (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education). While private institutions are not required to have NCATE accreditation, all of them do except for one fairly new program.*
- ***Student Quality:*** *North Carolina has developed skills tests that are used with undergraduates who indicate interest in becoming a teacher.*
 - *North Carolina has a serious shortage of minority students who become teachers. The state is struggling to come up with incentives in this regard.*
 - *Grade point average data and analysis of SAT scores show that students who successfully complete a teacher preparation program are among the strongest students academically at 10 of the state's 15 teacher preparation institutions. These data debunk the "myth" that is frequently reported nationally that students who want to be teachers are among the weakest academically. These 10 institutions are the ones with the most selective standards in the North Carolina university system. Therefore, graduates who actually become licensed teachers are among the brightest at these institutions.*

In his remarks, Dr. Coble urged the Virginia Board of Education to consider several points related to the public reporting of such data:

- 1. Be extremely careful with the definitions used for the various data points. If the definition of the information being requested is confusing, the data will be compromised. Dr. Coble gave several examples of how North Carolina has encountered data-reporting problems related to unclear definitions or definitions that do not allow for the wide variation in the program parameters at the different institutions. This is an extremely difficult and complex, but critically important, task. As a result of the complexities of the data-gathering, North Carolina has spent significant funds in developing a web-based reporting system. This is expensive and time-consuming work.*
- 2. A state-supported coaching program to help students prepare for the PRAXIS test will be helpful.*
- 3. In reporting data to the public, it is helpful to have a “warm-up year” in which the performance report is considered as still in the field-test stage. This helps work out the problem areas and inaccuracies and helps the press understand the nature of the data. This may help the public in understanding the whole process.*

Dr. Coble explained the second point above. Experience in North Carolina supports the positive benefits to students when they receive well-done PRAXIS test preparation programs. Dr. Coble pointed out that there is an entire industry surrounding helping law school graduates pass the bar, medical students pass the medical boards, CPA candidates pass the CPA exams. However, to date, no equivalent support/coaching system has been developed to help students pass the PRAXIS examinations (which are rigorous). North Carolina is now developing such a program. Their experience shows that students that go through these programs do better overall. This is important not only to the student taking the test but to the institution whose scores are being publicly reported, as well. Dr. Coble related the different pass rates reported for institutions that provide a PRAXIS coaching program versus ones that do not. The evidence is clear: the coaching programs help significantly.

Dr. Coble related additional information about North Carolina's requirements related to the PRAXIS tests. North Carolina has some of the highest cut-off scores in the country. The Performance Report contains PRAXIS scores. The North Carolina Board of Education is now adjusting some of the PRAXIS requirements, including raising the cut-score for the elementary program area and lowering the mathematics score requirements. The mathematics scores are still among the highest in the country, but the previous score requirements were found to be excessively high and were weeding out well-qualified teacher candidates. All institutions in North Carolina that do not have a 70 percent pass rate in any one of the PRAXIS test areas must submit a report to the State Board of Education by May 15th of each year. Overall, the state's pass rate is 72 percent. This means that 28 percent of the students are failing at least one of the PRAXIS tests. The institution's report must include specific strategies to remediate the problem areas identified by the test results.

Dr. Coble cautioned that gathering accurate PRAXIS data is extremely difficult because the students are the ones who possess the scores, not the institution. The testing company will not release raw data to the institutions due to privacy considerations.

The Performance Report shows that 63 percent of North Carolina's teacher preparation graduates are actually teaching in a North Carolina school one year after graduation. This varies greatly by institution. Many of the graduates are in graduate school or have left North Carolina and are teaching in another state. North Carolina is currently working with Educational Testing Service to help track graduates who move out of the state of North Carolina. North Carolina hires many of its teachers from Pennsylvania and West Virginia. This is likely the situation in Virginia. Pennsylvania is getting concerned that it is supplying so many teachers for other states and has considered cutting back on some of its programs.

Demographic patterns in North Carolina show that most teacher preparation graduates take a teaching position within 75 miles from the location of the college they just graduated from. This pattern holds for a number of other states as well. Typically, college students come from a town/city that is located 50-75 miles from the college they are attending, and they tend to take a job after graduation that is 50-75 miles from the institution. In short, they go back home to teach.

These data support the conclusion that the state needs solid teacher education programs in each region of the state; otherwise, certain regions of the state will have greater difficulty recruiting new teachers.

In response to a question from Mr. Schroder, Dr. Coble pointed out that students may initially start out in a geographic region within 75 miles from their college; however, after approximately three years, many (those who are mobile) will migrate into areas of the state that have higher teacher salaries.

Ms. Noble asked whether Dr. Coble thought the patterns described above created a distribution problem or a teacher shortage problem for North Carolina. Dr. Coble responded that up until five years ago, North Carolina's teacher shortages were really closely related to distribution patterns of teachers (migrating to higher-paying regions of the state). Within the past five years, however, North Carolina has had a persistent and increasingly problematic shortage in the number of available teachers. This shortage problem is exacerbated by the migration patterns, plus the unprecedented growth in North Carolina's student population (currently 4th fastest student population growth rate in the U.S.). Dr. Coble characterized North Carolina's teacher shortage as a crisis last year and a crisis pandemic this year. The under-supply is critical.

Ms. Noble also asked whether or not North Carolina has an emergency license for teachers. Dr. Coble responded that they have a range of license options. Local divisions may hire persons they deem as qualified to teach and may offer a local license to that person. This license does not transfer to other divisions nor is the holder of this local license eligible to progress to the state license. North Carolina is developing a new program called NCTeach, which is a mid-career switcher program. It is designed

to attract a whole new body of persons into the teaching profession. Dr. Coble stated that North Carolina has a large number of lateral entry teachers (career switchers) who are progressing toward full state licensure.

Dr. Coble reported the results of a recent survey of first-year teachers in North Carolina. The survey also included the mentors of the first-year teachers and their principals. The survey asked them about their preparation program in general, evidence of being able to manage a classroom, use of technology for instruction in the classroom, and skills with diverse learners. The results formed a pattern, as follows: the first-year teachers typically rated themselves and their skill levels as lower than the mentor teacher rated them. The principals rated the first-year teacher higher than the mentor teacher did.

The results of the survey also showed that North Carolina needed to do more to help teachers in the area of using technology effectively. The legislature has now provided funding to help with this area. Also, a technology specialist is now placed at each teacher preparation program at each state institution to work with the faculty in order to help them learn to use technology better and to teach their students how to use technology. In Dr. Coble's opinion, this has been one of the best things North Carolina has done for teacher development in the state.

He also pointed out that in North Carolina, there are fewer than 800 teacher education faculty members who must supervise and teach more than 5,000 students. This high student/teacher ratio makes it extremely difficult to ensure an appropriately supervised internship experience for students.

Next year, North Carolina will begin its new accountability program that requires that teacher preparation institutions be rank-ordered based upon scores on the criteria defined by the state. The criteria are as follows:

- 1. Compliance with state and federal requirements;*
- 2. Quality of the program completers (based on data reported in the Performance Report); and*
- 3. Involvement with and service to the public schools.*

A system of awards and sanctions will be applied based on these rankings. Points are applied according to the institution's compliance with these criteria. The points are totaled and then the institutions are ranked accordingly. There are 150 possible points. At its last meeting, the state Board of Education set the policy that institutions receiving a score of 90 percent of the 150 possible points will be designated as an outstanding school of education. As such, the institution will receive its share of \$2.5 million in state-supported scholarship funds. Institutions falling at or below 70 percent of the total number of possible points will be designated as a low-performing institution and will be required to submit an improvement plan to the state Board of Education. Those with scores in-between are at standard. Low-performing institutions are given three years to correct deficiencies. If no improvement is seen, the program will be closed.

Dr. Coble stated that if the awards and sanctions were to have been in effect this year, no institution would have been made the outstanding school category. Next year, it is expected that 8 to 10 institutions will be so classified. However, the public display of the ranking is a tremendous sanction. This was a big public event in the state.

In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Dr. Coble responded that students receiving the scholarships under the new accountability program must agree to teach in a North Carolina school for each year that they receive the scholarship. North Carolina also has an extremely popular student loan program called the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program. North Carolina pays students up to \$6,500 a year for up to four years. Students must repay the loan by teaching one year in a North Carolina school for each year of the loan. The four-years is reduced to three if the student is teaching in a high-poverty district. The retention rate for teachers who come through this program is not higher than for teachers in general; however, the retention rate in the teaching profession is higher; e.g., these teachers who were helped by this program tend to go into leadership positions (principalships) at a significantly higher level. This is an outstanding program for leadership development.

Roundtable Discussion with Dr. Coble:

Mr. Schroder asked for Dr. Coble's opinion on the impact of the current job market on teacher supply and demand. Dr. Coble responded that North Carolina has regions of the state in which there is almost no unemployment. There are regions that are having economic stress. Where the economy is booming, it is difficult to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. They leave teaching for better-paying jobs. The options available to minorities and women are very attractive, and this causes huge problems in recruiting and retaining teachers. North Carolina is putting in place an incentive pay system to give teachers financial incentives to stay in the classroom (bonuses at the end of year one, year three, year eight). In addition, salary incentives for those with master's degrees are in place. Teachers may also receive a bonus for National Board certification. With all of the incentives in place, it is possible for an experienced teacher to earn a salary that is competitive with many of the jobs in the private sector (\$60,000 to \$70,000). However, North Carolina's average salary is still around \$31,000. Therefore, economics is a huge consideration for college students they are making career decisions.

Dr. Coble added that North Carolina has done some good studies on the departure rates for teachers. From the data, it is clear that for those who leave teaching after the first or second year, they point to their preparation as a primary cause for leaving. Salary is ranked second in the reasons given for leaving the profession. For those who stay in the profession beyond five years, lack of preparation is ranked 14th. The primary reason for leaving for these teachers relates to the lack of administrative support, lack of parental support, and student discipline. Salary issues ranked 4th in the listing of reasons for leaving the profession. Dr. Coble said that the institution officials in North Carolina felt that they could help with the "lack of adequate preparation" reason for leaving. With a strong support system in place (e.g., earlier,

longer, better internships, mentor programs), the transition into the first year of teaching could be greatly facilitated. The salary issue is one that must be addressed collectively (legislative, state board, local government).

In North Carolina, all training programs for school administrators have been totally revised. A few years ago, there were 14 programs; one year later, there were seven. Next year, that number will expand to nine. The remaining programs have more and better resources, all focused on the role of the principal as a supporter and developer of teachers. The \$40,000 scholarship program mentioned earlier in the meeting is also having a positive impact. North Carolina is experiencing a shortage of administrators; nonetheless, there are no plans to begin an alternative route for the principalship.

In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Dr. Coble stated that 40 percent of teachers leave after the first two years of teaching. This means that the schools are constantly orienting new staff. This also means that a new cadre of teachers must be trained every three to four years. This is a huge cost to localities and to the state. The good news is that North Carolina has found that the first wave of students coming through the longer internship programs have a much higher retention rate—almost 84 percent after five years. This says that if states invest in good teacher preparation programs, the retention rate of graduates is likely to be much higher. This makes good economic sense, as well as it provides a much better qualified teacher.

Ms. Noble asked whether North Carolina has a statewide mentor teacher program. Dr. Coble responded that there is mentor teacher pay, but no program to train mentor teachers. North Carolina provides a \$1,000 stipend, but no release time or agreed-upon training formula. Dr. Coble emphatically stated that statewide mentor teacher program is critical, and a training program is essential. North Carolina is trying to do this now.

Mr. Schroder asked Dr. Coble his thoughts on the primary lessons learned from the experience of the reform North Carolina has undergone. In responding to the question, Dr. Coble briefly described how schools of education throughout the country eliminated the on-site, laboratory school model from its curriculum. Dr. Coble pointed out that medical schools have extensive internships, but education does not. The medical model has much to offer in the training of classroom teachers. What North Carolina did was move to a partnership arrangement with certain public schools. Here they learned about the different culture of a higher education and public schools. Schools do not reward teachers for working with student teachers, and the reward structure for teacher preparation faculty does not for working with student teachers. At the college level, much more emphasis is placed on doing research than on working with students in the field. So, the lesson here is that the state needed to find a better way to recognize and reward both the school and the college faculty for their work in preparing better teachers.

Dr. Coble mentioned several other issues. Dr. Coble is now working to get the mentor teacher pay (\$1,000 per year) for those teachers who are cooperating teachers (those who work with student teachers). Cooperating teachers must spend a tremendous

amount of time in helping to train the student teacher, and they currently receive no salary benefit for this service. The state is also moving to a system to reward college faculty for their work to develop and sustain sound working relationships with the public schools in which they place their student teachers. There is also a strong movement to increase the state operating funds for teacher education programs in North Carolina. The request for the increased funding is based in part on the costs for operating a sound clinical internship experience.

Mr. Schroder asked for Dr. Coble's opinion on performance-based accountability systems. Dr. Coble responded that North Carolina is certainly moving in that direction. The North Carolina Board of Education has recently voted to drop the performance-based PRAXIS test. Instead, North Carolina will judge institutions not on the ability of the students to pass PRAXIS, but rather in the students' ability to perform on the state's performance-based licensing program, which is quite rigorous. This is a new type of licensure examination. It is a real-time on-site evaluation with feedback to the institution. All teachers in North Carolina must go through this test, even those applying for a continuing license. Dr. Coble also pointed out the nationally NCATE has instituted a new performance-based accreditation system that will be in effect in the near future. This will also be a more expensive accreditation process than that in current use.

Mr. Schroder noted that judging the quality of a teacher preparation program needs to consist of more than simply the number of licenses awarded. Dr. Coble sees the quality of the program inextricably tied to the depth of the relationship and the partnership of the institution and the schools. Mr. Schroder stated that his view of the Board of Education's objective is to make sure the institution is providing licensed, quality teachers. Mr. Schroder observed that, according to Dr. Coble's comments, the key to the quality of the teacher preparation program is in the clinical internship component. This is the bridge to a quality program and a quality teacher. Dr. Coble agreed with this observation. Mr. Schroder added that a solid clinical internship experience has the potential to support the teacher in a number of ways that help the teacher survive the first few years of teaching, which is where the high turn-over rates so apparent. Dr. Coble said that students must be carefully placed and well supervised. Otherwise, the clinical experience could be damaging to the student. Institutions often have great difficulty in providing high levels of supervision.

Dr. Coble emphasized that top-down directives are counter-productive to quality. The key is to develop and maintain solid communications with all institutions and entities involved. In North Carolina, a coordinating committee consisting of representatives of K-16 meets once every three months for an all-day session to troubleshoot issues and help formulate solutions. This committee deals with the K-16 policies and issues. The NC Teach program (mentioned earlier) emerged from this group, as did the plans for the statewide mentor teacher-training program. Therefore, the work of the committee has proven successful and useful. The community college system is represented on this committee, especially in light of the data that showed that 32 percent of the teacher preparation graduates came through the community college system. The private colleges are also represented on the committee. In Dr. Coble's

opinion, forming this committee was one of the best things North Carolina has done to keep a positive agenda and to move forward.

Dr. Coble closed his remarks by stating that if he could recommend only one thing to the Virginia Board of Education, it would be that Virginia put together such a coordinating committee to keep its reform on track and to develop new ideas for effective programs.

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Schroder thanked Dr. Coble for his helpful and interesting presentation.

Presentation on the Connecticut Experience by Dr. Betty Sternberg:

Mr. Schroder introduced Dr. Betty Sternberg. Dr. Sternberg has been the Associate Commissioner for the Connecticut Department of Education since 1992 and heads the Division of Teaching and Learning. Dr. Sternberg has extensive experience in developing and implementing programs for recruiting and retaining teachers of high quality. Mr. Schroder welcomed Dr. Sternberg to the Board of Education's Planning Session and thanked her for coming.

Dr. Sternberg began her presentation by stating that it was interesting that the Board began its meeting (Wednesday, April 26) with the discussion of accreditation of schools, noting that accreditation issues cannot be addressed without addressing the issue of teacher quality. Neither can be successful without the other. Virginia and Connecticut have both established learning standards for students (Virginia: the Standards of Learning; Connecticut: the Common Core). The standards are the what we are teaching. Now the board turns its focus to how well teachers are teaching. This forms the how we are teaching. In addition, Connecticut has just issued a Common Core for Teachers, which forms the foundation of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do.

Connecticut differs from Virginia in several key ways. Connecticut has 500,000 pupils; Virginia has 1.2 million. Connecticut has approximately 40,000 teachers; Virginia has more than 86,000. Connecticut and Virginia both have an aging teaching force. Connecticut began its current teacher development and accountability programs in 1980; thus the program has been underway for a number of years.

Dr. Sternberg said that no one isolated feature would get a state to its goal of raising student achievement. The job requires a comprehensive approach and a long time for implementation. When Connecticut started its program in the early 1980s, it was far from being first in the nation. At that time, Connecticut was 37th in the nation in teacher salaries; today it is ranked first. Connecticut did not have objectives or measures of student achievement; now those objectives and measures are in place and working well. Connecticut has had the benefit of a long time to fine-tune its programs in order to make them better.

The issues of attracting and retaining teachers came to the forefront in Connecticut in 1980 under the leadership of the Commissioner who was aware of the work of the Presidential Commission that resulted in the Nation at Risk report. At that time, the Connecticut Department of Education was reorganized to form a division of professional development, and Dr. Sternberg was hired as the director of that division.

To address the teacher quality issue, Connecticut began by forming a 45-member commission comprised of representatives of every major education group and other groups concerned with education. The purpose was to get buy-in for the recommendations that would emerge from the group. In April 1982, the commission issued its report. It contained 25 recommendations for ensuring professional competence for teachers. The work of this commission was fundamental to the success of the later initiatives because this commission came up with the conceptual framework for the professional development continuum model that has been used since. The framework provides a way to structure programs to improve student awareness, programs to attract prospective teachers, programs to prepare prospective teachers, programs to induct, and programs to continually educate teachers. The commission divided itself into five subcommittees to study these topics in detail.

As a part of its work, the commission sponsored a study to determine the satisfaction of the classroom teacher with a number of school-related factors. The results showed that one-third of the classroom teachers were dissatisfied. Forty percent of those surveyed indicated that they had no intention of staying in the profession. How did these factors change over the intervening years? Dr. Sternberg reported that, as the program was implemented and teachers were seeing the benefits, the forty- percent figure declined significantly.

The study found that, in the teachers' opinion, the most critical issue was the perceived lack of respect for the profession. This outweighed salary considerations. Teachers also reported that their preparation programs were not useful or helpful to them once they got into the classroom.

In the early 1980s, Connecticut experienced a forty percent decrease in the number of students indicating a preference to enter the teaching profession. Also, SAT scores for teacher education students lagged behind those of students in other majors. Clearly, these statistics indicated that Connecticut had a problem brewing among its teacher ranks.

The commission came up with eight recommendations, as follows:

- 1. Increase the salaries of the beginning teachers;*
- 2. Increase the salaries of the teachers currently in service;*
- 3. Establish career ladders for teachers;*
- 4. Improve working conditions and benefit packages for teachers;*
- 5. Create or improve professional development programs for teachers;*
- 6. Establish school/business partnerships;*
- 7. Establish programs to attract students into teacher preparation programs and provide teacher preparation programs of high quality; and*

8. *Develop and implement a public information campaign.*

Since the report was issued, several of the recommendations have been implemented; however, Connecticut has not developed a career ladder program, nor is there a differentiated staffing program in place.

Connecticut is just now experiencing teacher shortages. Prior to the past few years, Connecticut schools experienced an abundance of teacher applicants, rather than a shortage. Large numbers of Connecticut teachers are now within a few years of retirement, and the state will need a substantial number of potential teachers to accommodate this pending shortage.

Another interesting issue facing the profession today is the frequent references to the stressful climate in the schools. Some teachers report that the accountability programs in place in states serve to increase that feeling of stress in the workplace.

As a result of recommendation five, the legislature formed a Professional Development Council and every school district was required to submit a five-year professional development plan for teachers. The plans were reviewed and approved by the Council.

In 1986, Connecticut's legislature passed the Educational Enhancement Act.

Prior to Connecticut's initiatives, the state had no measures or competencies for teachers, little in the way of licensure requirements, no alternative routes into the teaching profession, and no performance standards for teachers. The current programs in place provide objective measures for each of these areas.

In response to a question from Mr. Schroder, Dr. Sternberg said that Connecticut is a binding arbitration state.

One of the mistakes Connecticut made in its teacher development program was that it did not include programs or initiatives for administrators. No attention was given to administrator salaries or training programs. In part as a result of this, Connecticut is now experiencing pervasive problems in finding and retaining high quality administrators, and principals' salaries are not as competitive as they should be. Thus, Dr. Sternberg recommended to the Board that it not overlook the development of good administrators.

The program in Connecticut now includes a two-step licensure program, consisting of an initial certificate that is effective for one year. During the first two years, teachers go through a support program entitled the Beginning Educators Training and Support Program. Each new teacher is assigned a mentor teacher. The mentors are trained for this role and are paid for their services. New teachers are assessed during this time. These would be in-classroom assessments that were done by assessors who were trained and paid. The new teachers were assessed on their classroom skills while actually performing his/her duties in the classroom. In response to a question from Ms. Noble, Dr. Sternberg noted that the mentor and the assessor were not the same person. Actually, the assessor was a person from a different school district.

The provisional certificate is available to teachers who complete 30-hours of coursework related to the teaching area or complete requirements for the master's degree. In Connecticut, more than 88 percent of the teachers have master's degrees, due in part to this requirement. After the teacher receives the master's degree or the 30-hours of coursework, then the teacher is eligible for a professional degree. This professional license is a five-year renewable license, and is renewed by the teacher receiving nine continuing education credits.

Several years ago when the state first instituted the five-year renewable license, it had a system in place whereby, after three years of successful teaching, one could receive a lifetime license. Moving to the five-year renewable license was very controversial, even though the officials at the department of education and other key organizations worked intensely together to ensure as smooth a transition as possible. The Connecticut Education Association (CEA) filed suit against the state board for what the CEA alleged to be a violation of teachers' property rights with the lifetime license. The CEA did not prevail in court.

Mrs. Davidson asked about the recertification points that teachers earn for license renewable. Of the nine continuing education credits a teacher must earn during the five-year time frame, does the state or the teacher absorb the cost of this? Dr. Sternberg responded that the state board required all local divisions to provide professional development programs for their teachers. The requirement is for 90 hours of continuing education every five years; thus, a teacher could satisfy the requirement by attending the professional development programs offered in the local district. Mrs. Davidson noted that Virginia requires at least 180 hours of professional development every five years.

Dr. Sternberg added that the state offers one- and two-week summer professional development institutes for teachers. These are excellent and quite popular among teachers. Mrs. Davidson said that some divisions in Virginia provide a variety of professional development programs; others provide very little. It is up to the teachers to seek out and to pay for programs themselves.

Dr. Sternberg described the actions that the state has taken to address problems in several areas, as follows:

- *Quality of students who enter teacher preparation programs: Dr. Sternberg explained that Connecticut examined the standards that were being used by teacher preparation programs. It was found that low-achieving students were being admitted to the programs. At the time, the standards were so vague that quality was sacrificed. By consensus of a number of key organizations and educators, Connecticut instituted a state-developed reading, writing, and mathematics skills test that students were required to pass before they were admitted to a teacher preparation program. A waiver provision was put in place whereby if a student had a combined SAT score of at least 1000, a candidate could receive a waiver and did not have to take the state test. The SAT score requirement was moved to 1100 a few years ago.*

In response to a question from Mr. Schroder, Dr. Sternberg said that instituting the testing requirement raised the quality of the applicant pool for the teacher preparation programs. This can be seen by analyzing the SAT scores of applicants over the past few years. The tests scores of applicants have shown significant increases over that time period.

Applicants to teacher preparation programs are required to have at least a B+ grade point average, two letters of recommendation, and an interview. Instituting these standards for admission has helped raise the quality of the student entering teacher preparation programs.

- *Ensuring well-qualified faculty: Connecticut officials were concerned that the teacher preparation faculty members are in-touch and well qualified. While there had been extensive impetus for professional development for public school teachers, there had been no similar discussion for higher education faculty. This is a difficult issue to grasp due, in large part, to the nature of colleges and universities (e.g., academic freedom issues) and the way they are governed. Nonetheless, Connecticut currently requires all higher education institutions to have professional development plans for their faculty members. Dr. Sternberg expressed her reservations about the effectiveness of this effort.*
- *Building strong relationships with the schools: Connecticut also places a great deal of emphasis on strong partnerships between the teacher preparation programs and the schools in which the cooperating teachers work. The state requires that the institutions develop and nurture these relationships. This requirement has met with widespread success.*
- *Curriculum of teacher preparation programs: the state wanted to make sure that the teacher preparation programs were up-to-date and of solid value to teachers once they transition into the classroom. There were also lots of concerns about the length and quality of the student teaching experience. When Connecticut began to address these issues, they formulated a set of 15 teaching competencies around which their teacher training programs are now based. For example, the list of competencies includes the following: facility in reading, writing, and math; knowledge of one's subject area; knowledge of human growth and development related to teaching and learning; knowledge of the American public school system.*

Connecticut's beginning teacher program (the BEST program) and the state's mentor teacher training program are centered on these competencies. The BEST program pairs the new teacher with a trained mentor who helps ease the transition into teaching. This program has been a big success and has been found to be especially beneficial to the mentor teachers, who report that they learn a great deal that helps them in their own classrooms. The BEST program was developed in response to a clear and pervasive need to provide structured assistance to new teachers. The program provides assessors (trained and paid) in addition to the mentors. The assessors visit each teacher to whom they are assigned six times over the first year.

Mentor teachers were originally paid \$1,000 per year. Currently, mentor teachers do not receive a stipend from the state. Cooperating teachers receive \$500 per semester.

Dr. DeMary asked a question concerning the professional development of college faculty. Dr. DeMary explained that, in certain regions of the state, we are having difficulty finding a college that can provide across-the-board, high quality professional development programs to local teachers to help them teach the SOL better. Has Connecticut experienced any similar difficulties? Dr. Sternberg responded "yes." Connecticut's learning standards are different from Virginia's in that Virginia's are much more specific. Connecticut has established a panel of professionals who will recommend specific training components and strategies to use in the summer institute programs. Dr. DeMary expressed her concern that we have many teachers who want to do a good job but the specific training they need. In some areas of the state, it is difficult to get the appropriate training done, if college faculty do not step up to fill this need. This is a major dilemma for Virginia as we look at the high expectations we have for teachers, students, and schools. In Virginia, we have \$26 million for the biennium to do quality professional development programs.

Along these lines, Mr. Christie noted his concern that education schools nationally and, to a certain extent, in Virginia are dominated by an ideology that refuses to accept some common sense programs (i.e., phonics-based programs, direct instruction). If a method or program does fit the faculty's ideology, it is dismissed even though the method has proven effectiveness. While this is not the case in all education schools, it is pervasive.

Dr. Sternberg described the Connecticut Department of Education's priority to provide assistance to local school personnel. The state board has determined that the department's emphasis should be focused on those school divisions with the highest at-risk populations. The department has set a goal that over the next three years, department staff will have teacher training workshops that reach over 70 percent of the teachers in the state. This will be a train-the-trainers model.

Dr. DeMary pointed out that the Virginia Department of Education had originally proposed a research-based, statewide professional development program funded with state funds. However, local divisions clearly stated their preference that the funding come to the locality and the localities would determine the best way to spend the funds. Some school divisions turn to the local colleges for assistance, and in most areas of the state, this is more than adequate. However, some areas of the state struggle to find good quality professional development.

Connecticut has also addressed the topic of systematic evaluation of teachers in the classroom. When the Connecticut education reform began in the early 1980s, there was no requirement for teacher evaluations. The new standards require a systematic process for teacher evaluation. The role of the assessor created a tremendous amount of controversy, especially in light of the role of local personnel to do evaluations. This created tensions, but it is now producing positive results. The Connecticut assessment model is a portfolio model. In the portfolio, teachers are asked to provide evidence of students' work showing how they have learned over the time period.

Connecticut has a mentor program that includes a mentor team; i.e., a new teacher may have several mentors working with him/her in different areas. This has received a good response and is quite effective.

Presentation by Ms. Beverly Greenberg:

Mr. Schroder introduced Ms. Beverly Greenberg, a member of the Connecticut Board of Education for the past 12 years. Ms. Greenberg has served on the local school board level and is a former classroom teacher. Mr. Schroder expressed his appreciation to Ms. Greenberg. He added that members of the audience were invited to join the discussion, if they wished.

Ms. Greenberg began by saying that she is proud to represent the Connecticut board at this meeting. She thanked the Board of Education for the notebook (distributed to board members and the consultants) of very helpful and comprehensive readings provided to the consultants and other participants at this meeting. Mr. Schroder acknowledged Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher licensure at the Department of Education, for his leadership in putting the notebook together.

Ms. Greenberg noted that the Connecticut's nine-member Board of Education is apolitical and makes its decisions based, in large part, on consensus. There is not much dissention on the board. The board has two nonvoting student members who are very helpful to the board as a whole. Members are appointed to four-year terms. The legislature is supportive of public education. Currently, Connecticut's reform is driven by the legislature, even though the reform initiative began with the former commissioner. Connecticut now has in place a wise and sensible reform program.

In order to do its job, a board needs good information, good leadership, and continuity. Turnover in leadership creates problems in being able to implement programs. Board members must have respect for teachers.

Mr. Schroder asked Ms. Greenberg for her thoughts on the most important components of the Connecticut experience. Ms. Greenberg responded that Connecticut did two things that, in her opinion, were crucially important to their programs' effectiveness. First, they raised their standards. Second, they raised their teacher salaries. These two things go together. They give the profession status.

A state can raise salaries by setting the bar higher for entry into teacher preparation program and by giving an exit exam. In Connecticut, these two things were put together as a package, and the legislature funded it. Dr. Sternberg added that there was one thing that they did not do that they have regretted. Along with raising standards and salaries, Connecticut should have increased the time element; i.e., longer school day or school year. This would have provided the much-needed time for professional development.

Connecticut has the highest average teacher salaries in the country (average salary is \$54,000). Salaries for beginning teachers are competitive with Virginia's; however, salaries in Connecticut go up faster than in Virginia. Initially, the legislature set the

minimum salary and funded a large portion of it. Over the years, the state legislature was unable to continue that level of funding, and passed those costs to the localities. In effect, the state boosted the salary levels, and then asked the localities to assume the costs.

Dr. Sternberg indicated that Connecticut is having a real problem in attracting principals because the salaries for administrators have not keep up with teacher salaries.

Another topic the Connecticut needs to work on more is the professional development for teacher preparation program faculty.

Betty Lambdin, from the Virginia Education Association, rose from the audience to ask a question. Are mentor teachers given release time for their mentor duties? Dr. Sternberg responded that the state's regulations require a time each week be set aside for the teacher and the mentor to meet. A small amount of funding was provided by the state to provide substitute teachers to help with the time commitment for mentor teachers.

Ms. Noble asked whether the mentors go through a training program. The answer was "yes." Ms. Noble asked whether Connecticut has any professional development schools. The answer was "yes." The mentor program lasts for one year, and some divisions continue the program for a second year. In Connecticut, teachers get a two-year initial certificate because the evaluation using the portfolio model requires an extended time period. The initial license can be extended to a third year, if needed.

In response to a question from Ms. Noble, both Dr. Sternberg and Ms. Greenberg emphatically recommended that the assessor and the mentor not be the same person.

Connecticut has a limited alternate route. Getting the alternate route in place was difficult, and it was widely opposed. The state gets about 125 alternate route teachers each year through an alternative teacher institute program. Persons apply to be admitted, and the competition to get in is significant. The retention rate is quite high for alternate route teachers. Dr. Sternberg feels this program is very successful. These teachers are mentored a bit differently in that they are required to be in the BEST program for two years, double the time for teachers who came through the more traditional routes. This has worked well.

Ms. Greenberg related her experience that the student teaching experience was very positive for her.

Mrs. Genovese asked whether the assessor gives feedback to the teacher. The answer was "yes." First-year teachers receive a mid-year portfolio-based assessment. The teacher is given the feedback and the mentor teams work together to address problem areas. Dr. DeMary asked what other evaluation tools/methods are used. Dr. Sternberg responded that Connecticut uses both PRAXIS I and II at the pre-service level. Dr. Sternberg explained that Connecticut moved away from the structured observation

because it became too mechanistic and was, therefore, not as helpful as the more in-depth portfolio.

Mrs. Palmiero asked whether the assessor's evaluation goes back to the teacher's college. The answer was "yes," but Dr. Sternberg cautioned that almost half of the teachers hired each year in Connecticut are from out-of-state. They are attracted to Connecticut's higher teacher salaries. They must, however, go through the BEST program. In Connecticut, every educator, even superintendents, have to pass PRAXIS I.

Mr. Christie raised the point of reciprocity. Do the teachers coming from out-of-state under reciprocity agreements have to complete the PRAXIS I and II requirements. Dr. Elliott responded that teachers coming from out-of-state must meet the following in order to receive a three-year provisional license in Virginia: must have graduated from a regionally accredited institution and have completed an approved teacher preparation program. The candidate must also pass PRAXIS I and II unless they have at least two years of full-time teaching experience. The PRAXIS is waived, in that case. Mr. Christie responded the state should address this issue and that all new teachers should pass the PRAXIS.

Dr. Sternberg noted that Connecticut is just now encountering teacher shortages. Connecticut now has classrooms going empty due to teacher shortages. The reality of the situation is that boards may want to consider some limited waivers related to the PRAXIS requirements.

Mr. Schroder asked about alternative licensure. What is the best route to follow? Should the state permit a variety of routes into the profession. Ms. Greenberg responded that she does not support the notion that there is only one way to become a teacher. She believes in outcomes: show what you can do and produce the results.

Does Connecticut have a professional standards board? How does Connecticut handle teacher discipline/revocation issues? At one time, the Connecticut Education Association lobbied for a separate board (Professional Standards Board) to handle these issues. The state board came out squarely opposed to the separate board and conducted a study that showed that the separate board would be expensive. The legislature lost interest in the idea. The board appointed a professional standards advisory board, but this did not totally satisfy the CEA. The advisory board is not very active or involved.

Mr. Schroder commented on the board's need to ensure that the colleges are providing quality programs that are responsive to what teachers will need in the classroom. Ms. Greenberg noted that good, comprehensive information is critical. Without information, we do not know whether the programs are doing a good job. Mr. Schroder observed that what Connecticut has done is to put state controls, using objective as well as subjective measures, on the entry into the teacher preparation programs. What was the reaction to these entrance requirements? Dr. Sternberg responded that when they first started discussions on the entrance requirements, the teacher preparation institutions were very uncomfortable. They were already

experiencing drops in enrollments. However, over the years, the effect of the requirements is leading to increases in enrollments, primarily because when the standards were raised, the “prestige/respect” factor was also raised. Raising teacher salaries also played into this. Again, standards and salaries go together.

Mr. Schroder added that he was concerned about what he hears about the “cash cow” and the other ways that education programs are treated. Connecticut’s regulations require that the education program be supported within the institution as a whole. In fact, Dr. Sternberg related that sanctions have been applied when the education programs are not valued by the institution. How do they define support? The response is that there are a number of objective measures to help obtain that information.

Mrs. Palmiero asked how many beginning teachers receive unfavorable assessments in the BEST program. The response was that very few end up with an unfavorable rating. They must make sure that the measures they use are reliable and valid to the point of being able to stand up in court in the event that a teacher is released as a result of the portfolio. Prior to the use of the portfolio, they had approximately a 3 percent rate of persons that did not make it through the BEST program. Under the portfolio model, 15-20 percent do not perform well on the first assessment. But most make the needed improvements.

Mr. Schroder asked the Connecticut consultants to respond to two questions: what are your regrets, and what do you need to do next?

Ms. Greenberg responded that Connecticut’s Board of Education should explore the following:

- *Create career ladders for teachers.*
- *Have differentiated pay, especially for National Board Certified teachers.*
- *Have a longer school year, and should pay them additional salaries for that; should have a 12-month contract for all teachers; the public will not fully respect the teaching profession until it is a 12-month job.*
- *Analyze the issue of retirement. Early retirement packages could help those who want to leave the profession.*
- *Craft programs to attract/help retirees that want to teach full or part-time.*
- *Do more to encourage/require professional development for college faculty.*
- *Have more perks for teachers.*
- *Make the environment more appealing to work in (day care, sabbaticals).*
- *Need money for mentors.*
- *Evaluate the successes and failures of the alternative route professionals.*
- *Need to determine whether elementary school teachers need differentiated credentials. There is research to show that the ways young children learn certain subjects require the teachers to have specially developed/honed skills in certain areas.*

Dr. Sternberg responded that Connecticut should have increased the number of teacher workdays when the salaries were being increased. Connecticut has a school

year of 180 days for both students and teachers, and local divisions can negotiate more, if they wish.

Dr. DeMary noted that the success of the students depends on the ability of the teacher to teach the content of the SOL. And that ability is tied to the teacher preparation program's ability to prepare that teacher adequately. She asked for an assessment of whether the colleges and universities in Connecticut have supported the initiatives for change. Were they able to teach the skills they needed to or are they simply "doing their own thing?" Ms. Greenberg said that teachers in Connecticut are buying into the testing program wholesale. They know it is here to stay. Connecticut developed its own skills test that has been around since the mid-1980s. Connecticut is also on its third generation of its tests. Dr. Sternberg responded that a lot of people spent a lot of time to get buy-in from all key players, including the colleges. One of the standards for approving a teacher preparation program related to whether or not the program's curriculum supports the state's learning objectives. One of the key things about the program now is that leaders are clearly seeing the positive results of the initiatives. Student achievement is clearly better, teacher preparation candidates are much better qualified, and teachers are more prepared to do their jobs. People really see the difference in their students and in their teachers as a result of Connecticut's education reform initiatives.

Connecticut does a lot of things to recognize and celebrate excellence in teaching. This program is based on teachers submitting curriculum plans, a teacher panel selects the best, and a booklet is compiled and distributed. All of these teachers are invited to attend a summer institute to put together the curriculum plans. The final event is a dinner in honor of these teachers. Thus, Connecticut's strategy is to recognize teachers for the work that they do as judged by other teachers. Corporate partners support this Celebration of Excellence program.

Dr. Sternberg stated that her biggest regret was that Connecticut did not think through and provide enough in the way of early retirement incentives and options.

Connecticut also had corporate support to do a public relations campaign to get the word out about the initiatives as they were being developed. Business leaders coordinated this. No state funds were used in this campaign.

Mr. Schroder closed the session by thanking Dr. Sternberg and Ms. Greenberg for helping the Board of Education learn more about the important issue of attracting, recruiting, and retaining high quality teachers. He congratulated them on the success of their efforts.

Mr. Schroder announced that the Planning Session would reconvene at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 28, 2000.

The Planning Session was adjourned for the day at 4:15 p.m.

Summary of Discussion: FRIDAY, April 28, 2000

The president, Kirk T. Schroder, called the planning session to order at 9:00 a.m. All members of the Board of Education and the Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, were present. Also joining the board was Mrs. Phyllis Palmiero, the newly appointed director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Mr. Schroder opened the session by welcoming all persons in attendance.

Ms. Noble introduced the college and university deans who will be assisting the Board at this session:

- Dr. Virginia McLaughlin, dean and chancellor of the School of Education at the College of William and Mary
- Dr. John Oehler, dean of the School of Education at Virginia Commonwealth University
- Dr. Gary Galluzzo, dean of the Graduate School of Education at George Mason University

Mr. Schroder asked that the deans share their views and insights stemming from the discussion at yesterday's session with the consultants from North Carolina and Connecticut.

Dean McLaughlin began by thanking the board for inviting the deans to be a part of this meeting focused on the really critical topic of teacher quality. This Planning Session builds upon an initiative earlier this year when the board invited representatives of all the teacher preparation programs to meet to discuss topics of mutual concern. At this meeting, attended by representatives of 34 institutions, the participants generated many ideas that were then captured in the series of briefing papers that served as background for this Planning Session. Dean McLaughlin complimented Dr. Thomas Elliott and his staff for this work.

Dean McLaughlin said that the deans were particularly pleased with the choice of presenters at yesterday's sessions. North Carolina and Connecticut have been in the forefront, and it became evident in their remarks yesterday that Virginia is wrestling with some of the same issues tackled by these other two states.

Dean McLaughlin said that yesterday's session was encouraging because we learned from these states, which have been recognized as leaders, that many of the initiatives that we have been pursuing here in Virginia are indeed key parts of the comprehensive reform agendas in North Carolina and Connecticut. The consultants were quite candid in sharing the successes and the failures of their initiatives—the lessons learned. This was very valuable.

Dean McLaughlin summed up her thoughts on the North Carolina and Connecticut programs as consisting of four C's:

Comprehensive: It is evident that for both the North Carolina and Connecticut programs, the scope is impressive. In tackling the issues of teacher quality and ensuring an adequate supply of well qualified teachers, they really looked at the issue as a critical piece of their statewide educational improvement efforts. The parts/components of their programs were put together systematically. This is an important model for Virginia to address.

Coherence: The careful attention to aligning and making sure that all of the different policies were working in concert were important to the success of North Carolina and Connecticut. They were attacking the problems they faced on all fronts to remove barriers and provide incentives, but they were careful to make sure that all of their policies were working together. This gets particularly tricky when you are looking at program approval and standards on the one hand and alternate route policies on the other. The lesson is to have guiding principles and to make sure these are the overarching principles when we make decisions on each of the different policy fronts.

Continuity: Both states emphasized that they had taken a long-term view. They described how long it had taken them to put together the many pieces of the programs. It is evident that the issues we are talking about cannot be dealt with in a four-year period. The states also affirmed that the efforts must be bipartisan. As educators, our job is to define the structure and build the base of support to ensure that we will have time it takes to have a successful agenda for change.

Collaboration: The level of serious involvement of the many constituents was truly impressive. Also impressive was the discussion of the ways in which the higher education community can work together with the pre-K-12 structures to advance the common agendas. The on-going mechanisms for dealing with issues and solving mutual problems really give us some good suggestions for things that we can do here in Virginia.

Dean McLaughlin said that the session yesterday underscored for her the need for complete and accurate information upon which to base our decisions. It was interesting that the information that was shared on North Carolina's performance report jived so well with the consensus of a group of deans and directors of the public institutions that had met in December at VCU. This group meets on a fairly regular basis to talk about common concerns. It was a strong consensus of that group that the institutions needed promote the design, development, and maintenance of a comprehensive database on teacher supply and quality. The demands of such a system would go beyond the capacity of any single institution or the Department of Education; therefore, pooling resources is critical.

In response to a comment from Mr. Schroder, Dean McLaughlin said that these data would be needed by institutions to meet Title II requirements and NCATE performance measures for accreditation. Also, SCHEV requires the institutions to have performance measures. The deans welcome the opportunity to work with the Board of Education to figure out ways to get this going. The model shared by North Carolina is an excellent place to start. Their experiences in defining the data points, web-based design, and other areas are all critical pieces of information to help us.

The discussions at this Planning Session underscored for Dean McLaughlin the need to create some systematic mechanisms for on-going dialog to occur, because in the absence of these opportunities, many of the unfortunate and negative stereotypes about higher education still persist. An on-going dialog would give the opportunity to share positive information about the teacher preparation programs. There is sometimes the perception that the higher education area is resistant or obstructionist, when, in fact, the institutions are doing a great deal to advance the reform agenda not only in preparing the next generation of teachers and administrators, but also to work actively in partnership with K-12 schools.

Dean McLaughlin emphasized that William and Mary wants to make sure that its graduates are ready to teach in Virginia's schools and the Standards of Learning. In addition, William and Mary wants them to have their eyes on national standards. About 50 percent of W&M graduates will teach outside the commonwealth. W&M, therefore, sees the SOL focus as necessary but not sufficient as the grounding for the teacher preparation program.

Mr. Christie commented that, from his conversations with teachers, principals, and superintendents across the state, there is resistance on the part of education schools to prepare their students to teach certain content-based or skills-based methods (e.g., phonics-based reading programs, direct instruction) due to ideological biases within the education school. Mr. Christie stated that this resistance—in some cases, hostility--persists even in the light of clear and compelling research showing that these programs are effective, especially in low-income settings. Mr. Christie asked the deans to comment on this observation. Dean McLaughlin indicated that on questions such as this, more complete information sharing would be helpful. Gathering data such as North Carolina has gathered would allow institutions to follow-up on their graduates to evaluate the validity of the teacher preparation in the actual classroom experience. A lengthy discussion followed. Dean Oehler said that the models described by North Carolina and Connecticut are based on the same approach that Virginia has historically taken. Teacher education is viewed as a continuum where we expect to have good practice for the entry-level person, but over the course of years, the teacher would need sound professional development. Incentives to encourage higher education institutions to work closely in partnership with the public schools can go along way to address the issues that Mr. Christie has raised.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Schroder recognized Dr. Wallace Saval, superintendent of the Petersburg City Public Schools, who described his division's success with the Success for All program.

Senator Russell added that he has noticed that there have been a number of education fads over the years.

Mrs. Genovese observed that, in some cases, teachers are not given a choice on the methods she would use in her classroom due to the directives of the school system. Dean Galluzzo responded that the institutions need to be sure that the programs prepare the teachers to go into the classroom and then school divisions need to have professional development programs that prepare the teachers to do the things that the divisions wants

them to do. Ms. Noble commented that a teacher must use many methods, including direct instruction, phonics, and others.

Senator Russell said that there should be differentiated pay for K-3 teachers because they have the really tough responsibility of teaching children to read. Dean Galluzzo responded that some states have moved in that direction. For example, Houston pays more for bilingual K-3 teachers than it pays for non-bilingual K-3 teachers. Dean McLaughlin added that some states give higher salaries to attract and retain math and science teachers.

Dean Oehler commented on several points:

- The board is right to focus on the recruitment of teachers. This focus will help to ensure that Virginia has the best-qualified teachers. Virginia has some programs in place that are helping in this regard. Virginia is moving to develop mentor programs. This will pay dividends.
- Professional development schools have been successful in a number of states.
- The board should consider working with the higher education community to provide incentives to redesign the master of education degree.
- The state should continue to provide and expand the incentives for teachers to get the National Board certification.
- Teacher preparation programs need to work closely with the colleges of arts and sciences to strengthen the academic knowledge of students.

Dean Galluzzo made several points to consider in the issue of teacher quality. First, we need to discuss what is meant by *competent* and *well qualified*, which are the words people are using. *Competent* means well educated; *qualified* means well prepared. Just because a person is well educated doesn't mean that they are well qualified. Alternative licensure programs must deal with this issue. Teachers need to know how to assess the progress of their students. The current classroom requires that teachers assess all the time and through many different methods. This means that Virginia must create standards. Currently, Virginia has no standards for teacher education. There is nothing concrete around which to design the programs. Both Connecticut and North Carolina have developed standards for their teacher preparation programs. Virginia should do the same. The bottom line is this: If Virginia wants to talk about quality, it must first set standards.

He added that his experience as the chair of the standards board in Colorado was that you can develop one set of standards for all school personnel, except for the administrators, who need a separate set of standards.

Dean Galluzzo said that we have the wrong majors for elementary education teachers. The most common majors for elementary level teachers are psychology and sociology. These are the two subjects that they do not teach. These teachers may have little in the way of science, math, or English---very important content areas for teachers. Therefore,

according to Dean Galluzzo, we are woefully underpreparing elementary school teachers in content knowledge.

Second, Dean Galluzzo raised the issue of the school culture. School is not an environment where smart people want to work. The research evidence is clear in this area. High GPA (grade point average) graduates leave after two to three years. Why? School is not an engaging place to work. Connecticut has come the closest to addressing this issue in increasing accountability, putting in an induction program, and raising salaries.

The three deans affirmed that, contrary to some perceptions, they would welcome more in the area of alternative routes to teaching. The deans also told the board that the majority—if not most—of their students are older than the traditional 22 year-old college graduates. The average age of the student coming out of the George Mason program is 33. This is the pattern at W&M and VCU. Dean McLaughlin added that this is certainly one area in which accurate information would be valuable because some of the popular conceptions about teachers are simply off-target.

Dean Galluzzo cautioned the board that judging the quality of an institution based on its PRAXIS scores is simply not valid. The PRAXIS score tells you more about the major in the arts and sciences than it does about the teacher preparation program. Most education schools in Virginia require students to pass the PRAXIS I before they are admitted into the program.

Dean Galluzzo closed his remarks by stating that the teacher preparation programs in the state want to do the right thing in the preparation of teachers. Most of the education schools in Virginia are working very hard to get on board and stay on board with the Standards of Learning program. The Board of Education should not have the perception that they are dragging their feet or resistant. If an education school is not doing the job, the board should close it. However, the problem with doing this is that Virginia has no standards. Dean Galluzzo asserted that Virginia has no standards that we can stand on that would withstand a court challenge. The board should set those standards, then hold the education schools accountable for the results. You cannot close an education school based on its PRAXIS test results alone. To do so would be closing the education based on the institution's admissions standards. We must look at *value added* when evaluating the quality of the program.

Dean McLaughlin added that Virginia has program standards, and we have the option of accreditation through NCATE. Currently, out of 37 approved programs in Virginia, 14 are NCATE-accredited.

Dean Galluzzo noted that Virginia's approved program standards are process-based. The standards do not require an institution to show that its graduates can actually teach children in the classroom. Dean McLaughlin said that one of the misconceptions about the higher education arena is that education schools would shy away from that level and type of accountability (i.e., performance-based evaluations). In fact, they would not. The education schools in Virginia are ready to get moving on designing programs and standards to do just that. Education schools would welcome the opportunity to show

what their students can do. Dean McLaughlin felt that a well-designed system of outcome performance measures would encourage colleges to be creative and flexible and more responsive to the school divisions with whom they work.

In short: Hold the education schools accountable for the performance of their graduates, and do not deal so much with the operation of the programs. Look at what the graduates can do and link that to the progress of their students in the classroom.

In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Dean McLaughlin suggested that the board might want to consider ways to encourage flexible working conditions such as job sharing and part-time employment for teachers. The board may be able to raise the issue of more flexibility in retirement benefits for retirees who may be interested in teaching. Currently, state retirement policies give no incentive to do this; rather the person is penalized financially.

Mr. Schroder stated that accountability in isolation would not raise teacher quality. The SOA and the SOL will not hold in the long run if we do not deal with the issue of teacher quality. This requires that we work together with the higher education community toward a common goal. This is no small task. He added that the board is keenly interested in the education schools because they provide a critical mission for the board. He also expressed concern over the issue of the status of some education schools within their institution.

The Plan of Action:

Mr. Schroder said that the board's goal for this Planning Session is to come up with a plan of action to address the teaching profession in a coherent and collaborative way. Mr. Schroder summarized the major points that emerged during the discussions:

1. We need to establish a mechanism for collaboration that is "institutionalized" and on-going (not a short-term effort). The key players in this endeavor should be the board, SCHEV, teachers, teaching institutions, and perhaps legislators; and
2. Our first task is to help establish the data collection process and operation in order to generate the comprehensive, accurate information we need to make recommendations and set policy.

Mr. Schroder stated that he would like for the board to put together a group that would be institutionalized that would have several goals:

1. The immediate goal will be to figure out the data collection needs and process;
2. Make recommendations regarding a process for accrediting education schools; and
3. A long-term goal will be to develop the overall, comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Palmiero stated that her thinking is very similar to Mr. Schroder's. A group such as the one Mr. Schroder has proposed would provide a valuable way to enhance collaboration among the many diverse parties involved. SCHEV and the board will be meeting in May, providing an excellent time to get this initiative started.

Mr. Schroder suggested that SCHEV and the board jointly adopt a charter to establish a standing joint commission on the teaching profession. The joint resolution could be reviewed and adopted at the joint session scheduled for May 25, 2000. Representatives of other key groups and organizations could be invited to become members of this commission.

The board discussed various options for setting up the joint commission, and the consensus that emerged included that the commission should:

- Take a comprehensive approach to the teaching profession (K-16 “pipeline” issues could be included);
- Have key policy players involved (including representatives from the community colleges, legislators, teacher preparation programs);
- Have an initial focus on the teaching profession;
- Have a short-term and long-term agenda focused on the teaching profession; and
- Be a permanent and standing body.

Mrs. Palmiero and Dr. DeMary will draft a charter for consideration at the joint session.

The board members unanimously endorsed the proposal to establish a Joint Commission on the Teaching Profession, with the draft charter to be discussed and adopted at the May 25, 2000 joint session with SCHEV and the Board of Education.

Mr. Schroder closed the meeting by thanking Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher licensure and professional development, and Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and public affairs, for their help in planning this meeting.

The Planning Session adjourned at 11:25 a.m.